

# United States Patent and Trademark Office.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/617,569	07/11/2003	Robin A. Robinson	NOVV-003/00US	5752	
58249 75	58249 7590 10/31/2006		EXAMINER		
COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP THE BROWN BUILDING - 875 15TH STREET, NW SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-2221			HILL, MYRON G		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1648		

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/617,569	ROBINSON ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Myron G. Hill	1648			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Au	.gust 2006.				
	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>34-55</u> is/are pending in the application	1.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>34-55</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 11 July 2003 is/are: a)[		y the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).			
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.				
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	ity documents have been receive	ed in this National Stage			
application from the International Bureau	(PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) 🔲 Other:				

Art Unit: 1648

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

This action is in response to the paper filed 8/10/06.

Claims 34-55 are under consideration.

### Claim Objections Withdrawn

Claim 44 contains the trademark/trade name Novasomes®.

Applicant has amended the claims and the objection is withdrawn.

### Rejections Withdrawn

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 52 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has amended the claims and the rejection is withdrawn.

Claim 48 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled

Art Unit: 1648

in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant has amended the claim to recite approximately 80nm and the rejection is withdrawn.

### Rejections Maintained

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 34-42, and 45-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Latham *et al.* (J of Virology Vol 75, pages 6154-6165, from IDS) and Saito *et al.* (Vaccine 2001 Vol. 20 pages 125-133).

Applicant argues that the examiner has not met the burden of proving a prima facie case of obviousness, that the VLPs are made in cells not *in vitro*, points to MPEP 2112 and case law.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and not found persuasive.

Latham et al. and the specification make the VLPs by insect cells and would be expected to have the same properties. The VLPs of Latham et al. react with monoclonal antibodies in western blots and on fixed cells and are stated by Latham et al. to be useful as vaccines. The VLPs are shown to look like influenza virus particles (Figure 5). The proteins that make the VLP of Latham et al. appear to be wild type in structure and antibody binding. The VLPs of Latham et al. would be expected to have the HA and NA

Art Unit: 1648

activity of influenza. The claims recite no structures that differentiate them from the VLPs of Latham *et al.* 

Where, as here, the Patent Office lacks the facilities to perform comparisons between the claimed material and prior art materials that reasonably appear to meet the claim limitations, the burden is properly shifted to applicant to distinguish the claimed product from the prior art product. See *In re Best, Bolton, and Shaw*, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977); *Ex Parte Gray*, 10 USPQ2nd 1922 (BPAI 1989).

The rejection is maintained.

### New Rejection

Claims 34, and 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Latham *et al.* and Saito *et al.* as discussed above and Gupta *et al.* (Vaccine 2001 Vol. 14 pages 219-225).

Applicant argues that Latham et al. does not teach avian influenza.

Latham et al. and Saito et al. are discussed above and the combination result in avian influenza VLPs.

Latham et al. and Saito et al. do not teach adjuvants.

Gupta et al. teach Novasomes are good aduvants for protein immunogens and induce antibodies as well as reference adjuvants and also stimulate a TH1 like response with is involved in cell mediated immunity (Discussion pages 223-224).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have been motivated to use adjuvants with the VLPs because they are not living and adjuvants are known to increase the immune response to protein antigens. Latham *et al.* teach that the VLPs can be used as vaccines. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to make vaccine to influenza strains because there is a well known need to protect the people from influenza.

Thus, it would be *prima facie* obvious to make the VLPs of Latham *et al.* and Saito *et al.* with the adjuvants of Gupta *et al.* to make the claimed composition with the expectation of success knowing that adjuvants increase the immune response to protein antigens.

#### Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Myron G. Hill whose telephone number is 571-272-0901. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am-5 pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell can be reached on 571-272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1648

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Myron G. Hill V Patent Examiner 10/24/2006

> BRUCE R. CAMPELL, PH.D SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Bru Campell

Page 6